



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,370	10/03/2003	Robert W. Jones JR.	2003P00276 US01	4026

7590 04/28/2008
Alexander J. Burke
Intellectual Property Department
5th Floor
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

AHN, SANGWOO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2166

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/678,370	Applicant(s) JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner SANGWOO AHN	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-22 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claims 1 – 25 remain pending in this application with claims 15 – 22 and 25 being withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1 – 3, 14, 23 and 24 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 14, 23, 24 and their dependent claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, resulting from the amendments made to the independent claims 1, 14, 23 and 24.

Details of the new ground(s) of rejection are provided below in the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection section.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 – 7, 9 – 14 and 23 – 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication Number 2004/0088313 issued to Jose Torres (hereinafter “Torres”).

With respect to claim 1, Torres discloses,

A system enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external (Note: it is unclear what the Applicant meant by “external”. The term “external” can have a variety of interpretations in the analysis of the claim. For the purpose of further examination, Examiner interpreted the "documents external to said application" as "documents that are found either locally, on a LAN or on the internet) to said application (paragraph 24 lines 5 – 13: remote document management, external document storage for connected users, et seq.), comprising:

a map associating a set of access links (Note: a set of access links are inherently disclosed because it is embedded with the document information since the retrieval of the documents stored in databases from internal/external network can only be achieved if there is a location/address information which serves as a link to the corresponding document. Also, Torres discloses in paragraph 65 that search results will display at the bottom of the Document Search menu, a user can select the file to view and click view and the file will open → the search result list provides “links” that would lead to pertinent documents upon user selection.) with

(a) an application object identifier identifying computer executable code comprising a separable portion of a larger executable application (paragraph 46 and

table 1: the security levels comprising Systems Administrator, Administrator, Power user and User can be considered as the "object identifiers" because they define separable portions of a larger executable application that can be utilized by the authenticated user. For example, if the user logs in as the power user, then he/she only has uploading and indexing capabilities instead of having the full administrative privilege (which includes create/edit/delete projects, user profiles, groups, upload and index uploaded file, define search and display criteria, track user usage, etc.))

(b) an organization identifier identifying an organization, said set of access links supporting access to documents external to said application (Figure 1B, Figure 3 element 312, Figure 4, paragraph 9 lines 1 – 8: multilevel indexing enables data organization and retrieval, users can determine indexes by assigning desired attributes that become associated with the document, paragraph 23: information access and control across the Internet or an intranet, remote secure document archiving, paragraph 25 line 5: index is a linking device, paragraph 26, et seq.);

a link processor for initiating provision of data, the data representing a set of access links (Note: access links can be interpreted as file address or file location information), to a user in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier (paragraph 9 lines 7 – 8: indexes are used to search for the document, paragraph 65: enter the information in the field to search, search results will display at the bottom of the Document Search menu, a user can select the file to view and click view and the file will open → the search result list provides "links" that would lead to pertinent documents upon user selection); and

a command processor for initiating access to an external document using a link in said set of access links in response to user command (paragraph 24 lines 5 – 13: remote document management, external document storage for connected users, paragraph 9 lines 7 – 8, paragraph 11 lines 1 – 6: a multi-level search can be undertaken by a range search over a first index and used to produce a search result including data and documents of other index values that are related to the first index, paragraph 65, et seq.).

Note: Contrary to Applicant's assertion that the index link in Torres is NOT an application object identifier, it is respectfully submitted that the index link in Torres is not interpreted as the equivalent of the application object identifier by the Examiner. The ground(s) of rejection for the limitation “application object identifier” is provided above in detail.

Regarding claim 2, Torres discloses said set of access links supports access to documents from a plurality of different sources external to said application (paragraph 24 lines 5 – 13: remote document management, external document storage for connected users, et seq.), said map associates said set of access links with a role identifier, the role identifier identifying a particular user performable role (paragraph 12: access control and monitoring, access controls may be partial or total and may be based on user and document attribute profiles, security arrangements can allow for indexed parameters to launch a specific browser that has redaction enabled to allow only specific information to be viewed, paragraph 13: search restrictions are based on the security structure and are used to restrict user access to documents, portions of

documents, indexes or portions of indexes, paragraph 29: user authentication is based upon project or company designated requirements, et seq.); and said link processor initiates provision of data representing said set of access links to a user in response to a received role identifier (paragraph 54, et seq.).

Regarding claim 3, Torres discloses,

said map associates a plurality of sets of access links with

(a) a plurality of application object identifiers, the object identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of different application objects comprising functions including at least one of (a) patient treatment order entry, (b) specimen data entry, (c) test result data entry, (d) test results inquiry and (e) patient data reporting (Figure 5 elements 523, 525 and 527: Patient Profile and medical history report, paragraph 46 and table 1: the security levels comprising Systems Administrator, Administrator, Power user and User can be considered as the "object identifiers" because they define separable portions of a larger executable application that can be utilized by the authenticated user. For example, if the user logs in as the power user, then he/she only has uploading (equivalent to data entry) and indexing capabilities instead of having the full administrative privilege (which includes create/edit/delete projects, user profiles, groups, upload and index uploaded file, define search and display criteria, track user usage, etc.)); and

(b) a plurality of organization identifiers, the organization identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of organizations (Figure 1B, Figure 3 element 312,

Figure 4, paragraph 9 lines 1 – 8: multilevel indexing enables data organization and retrieval, users can determine indexes by assigning desired attributes that become associated with the document, paragraph 23: information access and control across the Internet or an intranet, remote secure document archiving, paragraph 25 line 5: index is a linking device, paragraph 26, paragraph 74: owner/company attribute, et seq.); and

said link processor selects a set of access links from said plurality of sets of access links in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier, the link processor initiating provision of data representing said selected set of access links to a user (paragraph 9 lines 7 – 8: indexes are used to search for the document, paragraph 65: enter the information in the field to search).

Note: Contrary to Applicant's assertion that the index links in Torres are NOT the set of access links, it is respectfully submitted that the index links in Torres are not interpreted as the equivalent of the set of access links by the Examiner. The ground(s) of rejection for the limitation “access links” is provided above in claim 1 rejection.

Regarding claim 4, Torres discloses said map associates said plurality of sets of access links with a plurality of role identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of roles performed by a user (paragraph 12: access control and monitoring, access controls may be partial or total and may be based on user and document attribute profiles, security arrangements can allow for indexed parameters to launch a specific browser that has redaction enabled to allow only specific information to be viewed, paragraph 13: search restrictions are based on the security structure and are used to restrict user access to documents, portions of documents, indexes or portions of

indexes, paragraph 29: user authentication is based upon project or company designated requirements, et seq.); and said link processor selects a set of access links from said plurality of sets of access links in response to a received role identifier, the link processor initiating provision of data representing said selected set of access links to a user (paragraph 12, paragraph 54, et seq.).

Regarding claim 5, Torres discloses said map comprises at least one of (a) a plurality of maps, (b) a data repository, (c) a database, (d) a plurality of databases, and (e) a plurality of data repositories (Figure 3 element 312, et seq.).

Regarding claim 6, Torres discloses an access link comprises at least one of (i) a universal resource locator, (ii) an internet protocol address, (iii) a storage file directory address, (iv) a storage file address, (v) a communication port address, (vi) a server address and (vii) an address for use in locating a document (See Note in claim 1 rejection, paragraph 65, et seq.); and a document comprises at least one of (a) a web page, (b) an HTML file, (c) a Word document, (d) an SGML document, (e) an XML document, (f) a multimedia file, (g) an Excel file, (h) a Portable Document Format file, (i) an executable file, (1) a text file and (k) an accessible file (Note: a set of access links are inherently disclosed because it is embedded with the document information since the retrieval of the documents stored in databases from internal/external network can only be achieved if there is a location/address information (which can be interpreted as the “storage file directory address” or “storage file address”) which serves as a link to the corresponding document (of course, a text file. See paragraph 26 lines 13). Also, Torres discloses in paragraph 65 that search results will display at the bottom of the

Document Search menu, a user can select the file to view and click view and the file will open → the search result list provides “links” that would lead to pertinent documents upon user selection, paragraph 8 lines 3 – 4, paragraph 67 lines 1 – 11, et seq.).

Note: Applicant merely asserted that Torres fails to disclose the feature of claim 6 without providing sufficient explanation. Examiner strongly maintains that Torres discloses such features as previously indicated.

Regarding claim 7, Torres discloses a menu window for displaying said set of access links to a user (paragraph 65, paragraph 67 lines 4 – 11, et seq.).

Regarding claim 9, Torres discloses said command processor initiates access to said external document using a link in said set of access links, the access to the external document being initiated from within said executable application object (paragraph 24 lines 3 – 4, et seq.).

Note: Contrary to Applicant's assertion that the index links in Torres are NOT the set of access links, it is respectfully submitted that the index links in Torres are not interpreted as the equivalent of the set of access links by the Examiner. The ground(s) of rejection for the limitation “access links” is provided above in claim 1 rejection.

Regarding claim 10, Torres discloses said command processor initiates access to said external document using a link in said set of access links concurrently with operation of said executable application object (paragraph 24, et seq.).

Note: Contrary to Applicant's assertion that the index links in Torres are NOT the set of access links, it is respectfully submitted that the index links in Torres are not

interpreted as the equivalent of the set of access links by the Examiner. The ground(s) of rejection for the limitation “access links” is provided above in claim 1 rejection.

Regarding claim 11, Torres discloses said application comprises a laboratory information system and said external document comprises information concerning at least one of (a) test procedures, (b) chemistry procedures, (c) microbiology procedures, (d) hematology procedures (e) phlebotomy procedures, (f) instrument support, (g) an electronic patient medical record, (h) orders to perform patient procedures, (i) laboratory test results and (j) a patient visit (paragraph 40 line 8 – 9, et seq.).

Regarding claim 12, Torres discloses an access link supports access to a second and different executable application; and said command processor initiates access to said second application (paragraph 28 lines 8 – 9, paragraph 65, paragraph 67 lines 4 – 11, et seq.).

Note: Contrary to Applicant's assertion that the index links in Torres are NOT the set of access links, it is respectfully submitted that the index links in Torres are not interpreted as the equivalent of the set of access links by the Examiner. The ground(s) of rejection for the limitation “access links” is provided above in claim 1 rejection.

Regarding claim 13, Torres discloses said organization identifier comprises a location identifier (paragraph 26, paragraph 74: owner/company attributes, et seq.).

With respect to claim 14, Torres discloses,

A system enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external to said application

(paragraph 24 lines 5 – 13: remote document management, external document storage for connected users, et seq.), comprising:

a map associating a set of access links with (Note: a set of access links are inherently disclosed because it is embedded with the document information since the retrieval of the documents stored in databases from internal/external network can only be achieved if there is a location/address information which serves as a link to the corresponding document. Also, Torres discloses in paragraph 65 that search results will display at the bottom of the Document Search menu, a user can select the file to view and click view and the file will open → the search result list provides “links” that would lead to pertinent documents upon user selection.)

(a) an application object identifier identifying computer executable code comprising a separable portion of a larger executable application (paragraph 46 and table 1: the security levels comprising Systems Administrator, Administrator, Power user and User can be considered as the "object identifiers" because they define separable portions of a larger executable application that can be utilized by the authenticated user. For example, if the user logs in as the power user, then he/she only has uploading and indexing capabilities instead of having the full administrative privilege (which includes create/edit/delete projects, user profiles, groups, upload and index uploaded file, define search and display criteria, track user usage, etc.)) and

(b) a role identifier identifying a particular user performable role, said set of access links supporting access to external documents (paragraph 12: access control and monitoring, access controls may be partial or total and may be based on

user and document attribute profiles, security arrangements can allow for indexed parameters to launch a specific browser that has redaction enabled to allow only specific information to be viewed, paragraph 13: search restrictions are based on the security structure and are used to restrict user access to documents, portions of documents, indexes or portions of indexes, paragraph 29: user authentication is based upon project or company designated requirements, et seq.);

a link processor for initiating providing data representing a set of access links (Note: access links can be interpreted as file address or file location information) to a user in response to a received role identifier and a received application object identifier (paragraph 12, paragraph 54, paragraph 9 lines 7 – 8: indexes are used to search for the document, paragraph 65: enter the information in the field to search, search results will display at the bottom of the Document Search menu, a user can select the file to view and click view and the file will open → the search result list provides “links” that would lead to pertinent documents upon user selection, et seq.); and

a command processor for initiating access to an external document using a link in said set of access links in response to user command (paragraph 24 lines 3 – 13: remote document management, external document storage for connected users, paragraph 9 lines 7 – 8, paragraph 65, paragraph 9 lines 7 – 8, paragraph 11 lines 1 – 6: a multi-level search can be undertaken by a range search over a first index and used to produce a search result including data and documents of other index values that are related to the first index, et seq.).

Claim 23 is rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claim 1 rejection.

Note: In response to Applicant's assertion that nowhere in Torres is there a mention or suggestion of access links associated with individual functions of an executable application, Examiner contends that Torres discloses this feature because Torres discloses assigning a security level to a user, and based on this security level, the user may or may not have access to or privilege to make certain changes to the restricted documents. In other words, even if the user has access privilege to document A (access link), he may only view the document and not be able to index the document (individual functions of an executable application). In this case, the access link would be the file location of the document, which is associated with the user who can access this document with a certain level of functional privilege (create, delete, index, etc.). See claim 1 rejection for detail.

Regarding claim 24, Torres discloses,

A method for enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external to said application (paragraph 24 lines 5 – 13: remote document management, external document storage for connected users, et seq.), comprising the steps of:

a map associating a set of access links (Note: a set of access links are inherently disclosed because it is embedded with the document information since the retrieval of the documents stored in databases from internal/external network can only be achieved if there is a location/address information which serves as a link to the corresponding document. Also, Torres discloses in paragraph 65 that search results will display at the bottom of the Document Search menu, a user can select the file to

view and click view and the file will open → the search result list provides “links” that would lead to pertinent documents upon user selection.) with

(a) an application object identifier identifying computer executable code comprising a separable portion of a larger executable application (paragraph 46 and table 1: the security levels comprising Systems Administrator, Administrator, Power user and User can be considered as the "object identifiers" because they define separable portions of a larger executable application that can be utilized by the authenticated user. For example, if the user logs in as the power user, then he/she only has uploading and indexing capabilities instead of having the full administrative privilege (which includes create/edit/delete projects, user profiles, groups, upload and index uploaded file, define search and display criteria, track user usage, etc.)) and supports an application function including at least one of, (a) patient treatment order entry, (b) specimen data entry, (c) test result data entry, (d) test results inquiry and (e) patient data reporting (Figure 5 elements 523, 525 and 527: Patient Profile and medical history report, paragraph 46 and table 1: the security levels comprising Systems Administrator, Administrator, Power user and User can be considered as the "object identifiers" because they define separable portions of a larger executable application that can be utilized by the authenticated user. For example, if the user logs in as the power user, then he/she only has uploading (equivalent to data entry) and indexing capabilities instead of having the full administrative privilege (which includes create/edit/delete projects, user profiles, groups, upload and index uploaded file, define search and display criteria, track user usage, etc.));

(b) a role identifier identifying a particular user performable role, said set of access links supporting access to external documents (paragraph 12: access control and monitoring, access controls may be partial or total and may be based on user and document attribute profiles, security arrangements can allow for indexed parameters to launch a specific browser that has redaction enabled to allow only specific information to be viewed, paragraph 13: search restrictions are based on the security structure and are used to restrict user access to documents, portions of documents, indexes or portions of indexes, paragraph 29: user authentication is based upon project or company designated requirements, et seq.);

a link processor for initiating providing data representing a set of access links (Note: access links can be interpreted as file address or file location information) to a user in response to a received role identifier and a received application object identifier (paragraph 12, paragraph 54, paragraph 9 lines 7 – 8: indexes are used to search for the document, paragraph 65: enter the information in the field to search, search results will display at the bottom of the Document Search menu, a user can select the file to view and click view and the file will open → the search result list provides “links” that would lead to pertinent documents upon user selection, et seq.); and

a command processor for initiating access to an external document using a link in said set of access links in response to user command (paragraph 24 lines 3 – 13: remote document management, external document storage for connected users, paragraph 9 lines 7 – 8, paragraph 65, paragraph 9 lines 7 – 8, paragraph 11 lines 1 – 6: a multi-level search can be undertaken by a range search over a first index and used

to produce a search result including data and documents of other index values that are related to the first index, et seq.).

Note: In response to Applicant's assertion that nowhere in Torres is there a mention or suggestion of access links associated with individual functions of an executable application, Examiner contends that Torres discloses this feature because Torres discloses assigning a security level to a user, and based on this security level, the user may or may not have access to or privilege to make certain changes to the restricted documents. In other words, even if the user has access privilege to document A (access link), he may only view the document and not be able to index the document (individual functions of an executable application). In this case, the access link would be the file location of the document, which is associated with the user who can access this document with a certain level of functional privilege (create, delete, index, etc.). See claim 1 rejection for detail.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torres in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,446,891 issued to Craig A. Kaplan et al. (hereinafter “Kaplan”).

Regarding claim 8, Torres discloses the system according to claim 1, as explained in 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection section.

Torres does not explicitly disclose a mechanism that determines an order of display of links in a window based on at least one of (a) a determined relative importance of individual links of said set of links to a role performable by a user, (b) a determined relative importance of links in said set of links, (c) alphabetical order, (d) a determined relative importance of links of said set of links to an organization and (e) another determined logical order.

However, Kaplan discloses determining an order of display of links in a window based on a determined relative importance of links in said set of links in column 3 line 66 – column 4 line 2 and various other parts of the disclosure. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time the invention was made to modify Torres’ system to incorporate Kaplan’s link-ranking feature, thus enabling a user interface that directs users to information actually desired by providing user-control over the order of information presentation.

Examiner further contends that the ordering method such as alphabetical ordering is well known in the art and used prevalently. Such method is capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well known.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SANGWOO AHN whose telephone number is (571)272-5626. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2166

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

4/21/2008

/S. A./

Examiner, Art Unit 2166

/Hosain T Alam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2166